

REMARKS

In the outstanding official action, the title of the invention was deemed to be not descriptive, and a new title that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed was required. In response, the present title is herewith cancelled, and a new and more descriptive title has been provided.

In response to the suggestion that section headings be provided, this suggestion is acknowledged but such headings have not been added as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a).

On the merits, the Office Action Summary indicates that claims 1-12 are rejected, but it is noted that the Action does not provide a specific statutory prior-art rejection for every claim (note, for example, the discussion of claim 9). Accordingly, should the following amendments not place the instant application in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the next Action be made non-final to avoid prejudice.

With regard to the rejection of independent claims 1 and 8 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorentz et al in view of Nakatani et al, claim 8 has been amended in order to more particularly and precisely recite the novel and unobvious subject matter of the instant invention, and it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 8, as herewith amended, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are clearly patentably

distinguishable over the cited and applied references for the reasons detailed below.

More specifically, claim 1, and claim 8 as amended, expressly recite that the passivating material is provided from the second side of the semiconductor element through the foil, and that this passivating material forms an encapsulation of the elements (claim 1). Claim 8 has been amended in order to add substantially the same limitation.

This limitation recites subject matter which provides an important commercial advantage over the prior-art technique of providing isolation material from the side edges (see, *inter alia*, page 2 of the instant specification) and is believed to be neither shown nor suggested in the cited and applied art. Furthermore, the rejections of claims 1 and 8 as presented in the outstanding action do not suggest that the cited and applied references show or suggest this commercially important limitation, and in fact do not address this limitation at all.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that, with the cancellation of independent claim 11 and claim 12, and the amendment of independent claim 8, all of the currently-pending claims now recite subject matter which is neither shown nor

suggested by the cited and applied references. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that allowance of claims 1-10 is now fully justified, and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Steven R. Biren, Reg. No. 26,531

Attorney

(914) 333-9630